

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application and for his helpful suggestions. Claim 3 was objected to for a typographical error, however, the typographical error noted by the Examiner is not present in the Image File Wrapper version of the claims available on the PAIR system nor was such a typographical error found in the applicants' record of the claims as filed. As a result, no amendment was made to claim 3 and the applicants request that the informality objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to sub-combination claims 20-22, and 28 for informalities, but no informality was identified. Consequently, sub-combination claims 20-22 and 28 have been amended to have formatting similar to claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner. The amendments to claims 20 and 28 do not constitute narrowing amendments for reasons relating to patentability.

Independent claims 2 and 3 have been amended to further define the invention over the cited references. Support for the amendments is found, respectively, at pg. 12, lines 15-18, and pg. 12, lines 26-29 of the specification as found on the PAIR system. Independent claims 21 and 22 have been similarly amended to further define the invention over the cited references.

The patentability of the claims is discussed in greater detail below. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**I. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, and 28 are Patentable**

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 20, and 28 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,476 to Lewin et al. ("the Lewin patent"). For the above noted independent claims, the Examiner correctly notes that the Lewin patent discloses signal processing units 82, 84, and 86. However, the Examiner incorrectly notes that "a mode line or an equivalent would be inherent in the design of Lewin et al. since the design as shown in Fig(s) 5 and 6 is bi-directional between the transceivers".

For example, as shown in FIG. 6, there is a line for signals TxENABLE and RxENABLE which switch signal processing units 82 and 84 between a transmit mode and a receive mode. However, no such line carrying

the signals TxENABLE and RxENABLE are shown going to the signal processing unit 84.

In contrast, independent claim 1, for example, recites a mode line connected to each signal processing unit for switching each signal processing unit between a transmit mode and a receive mode. The Lewin patent fails to disclose such. Independent claims 20 and 28 recite features similar to claim 1.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 20, and 28 are patentable over the prior art. Their respective dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features, are also patentable over the prior art and require no further discussion herein.

#### **II. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are Patentable**

The Examiner rejected original independent claims 2 and 3 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,366,622 to Brown et al. ("the Brown patent"). Amended independent claim 2, for example, now recites a control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, the control line communicating flow control information to stall at least one of the preceding signal processing units for feedback control of the signal processing units. The Brown patent fails to disclose such. Independent claim 3 recites features similar to claim 2.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the prior art. Their respective dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features, are also patentable over the prior art and require no further discussion herein.

#### **III. Claims 4-16 are Patentable**

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 4-6 as unpatentable over the Brown patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,713 to Sambamurthy et al. ("the Sambamurthy patent"). Claim 4 is based on a patentable claim 1, as argued above. The Sambamurthy patent fails to disclose the claimed mode line. Consequently, claim 4 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations.

Claim 5 is based on a patentable claim 2, as argued above. The Sambamurthy patent fails to disclose the claimed control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, with the control line communicating

flow control information to stall at least one of the preceding signal processing units for feedback control of the signal processing units. Consequently, claim 5 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations.

Claim 6 is based on a patentable claim 3, as argued above. The Sambamurthy patent fails to disclose the claimed control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, with the control line communicating flow control information to stall at least one of the signal processing units following in the signal processing chain for feedforward control of the signal processing units. Consequently, claim 6 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations.

The Examiner also rejected dependent claim 7 as unpatentable over the Lewin patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,686,668 to Koseki et al. ("the Koseki patent"). Claim 7 is based on a patentable claim 1, as argued above. The Koseki patent fails to disclose the claimed mode line. Consequently, claim 7 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations.

The Examiner further rejected dependent claim 8 as unpatentable over the Brown patent in view of the Koseki patent. Claim 8 is based on a patentable claim 2, as argued above. The Koseki patent fails to disclose the claimed control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, with the control line communicating flow control information to stall at least one of the preceding signal processing units for feedback control of the signal processing units. Consequently, claim 8 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations.

The Examiner also rejected dependent claim 9 as unpatentable over the Brown patent in view of the Koseki patent. Claim 9 is based on a patentable claim 3, as argued above. The Koseki patent fails to disclose the claimed control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, with the control line communicating flow control information to stall at least one of the signal processing units following in the signal processing chain for feedforward control of the signal processing units. Consequently, claim 9 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations.

The Examiner further rejected dependent claims 10 and 13 as unpatentable over the Lewin patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,349,647 to

Freiburg et al. ("the Freiburg patent"). Claim 10 is based on a patentable claim 1, as argued above. The Freiburg patent fails to disclose the claimed mode line. Consequently, claim 10 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations. In addition, claim 13 depends from a patentable claim 10 and recites yet further distinguishing features and is therefore patentable as well.

The Examiner also rejected dependent claims 11 and 14 as unpatentable over the Brown patent in view of the Freiburg patent. Claim 11 is based on a patentable claim 2, as argued above. The Freiburg patent fails to disclose the claimed control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, with the control line communicating flow control information to stall at least one of the preceding signal processing units for feedback control of the signal processing units. Consequently, claim 11 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations. In addition, claim 14 depends from a patentable claim 11 and recites yet further distinguishing features and is therefore patentable as well.

The Examiner further rejected dependent claims 12 and 15 as unpatentable over the Brown patent in view of the Freiburg patent. Claim 12 is based on a patentable claim 2, as argued above. The Freiburg patent fails to disclose the claimed control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, with the control line communicating flow control information to stall at least one of the signal processing units following in the signal processing chain for feedforward control of the signal processing units. Consequently, claim 12 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations. In addition, claim 15 depends from a patentable claim 12 and recites yet further distinguishing features and is therefore patentable as well.

The Examiner also rejected dependent claim 16 as unpatentable over the Lewin patent in view of the Sambamurthy patent. Claim 16 is based on a patentable claim 1, as argued above. The Sambamurthy patent fails to disclose the claimed mode line. Consequently, claim 16 is patentable because the proposed combination fails to disclose all the claimed recitations.

In re Patent Application of  
FURRER et al.  
Serial No. 10/614,523  
Filed: 7/03/2003  
Page 11 of 11

**IV. Claims 21 and 22 are Patentable**

The Examiner rejected original independent claims 21 and 22 as unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0096634 to Lin ("the Lin patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,880 to Lee et al. ("the Lee patent"). Amended independent claim 21, for example, now recites a control line to which each signal processing unit is connected, with the control line communicating flow control information to stall at least one of the preceding signal processing units for feedback control of the signal processing units. The Lin and Lee patent independently, or in combination, fail to disclose such. Independent claim 22 recites features similar to claim 21. Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 21 and 22 are patentable over the prior art.

**V. CONCLUSIONS**

In view of the forgoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this case is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain at issue that the Examiner feels could best be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below.

No fee is believed due with this Amendment, however, should a fee be required please charge Deposit Account 50-0510. Should any extensions of time be required, please consider this a petition thereof and charge Deposit Account 50-0510 the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

/ido tuchman/

Dated: July 18, 2007

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ido Tuchman, Reg. No. 45,924  
Law Office of Ido Tuchman  
82-70 Beverly Road  
Kew Gardens, NY 11415  
Telephone (718) 544-1110  
Facsimile (866) 607-8538